FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION 999 E Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20463

FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

7

7 8

1

2

3

9 10 11

12 13

14 15 16

17 18

19 20 21

> 22 23

24 25 26

27 28 PRE-MUR: 473
DATE RECEIVE

DATE RECEIVED: June 10, 2008

SUPPLEMENT RECEIVED: July 7, 2008 DATE ACTIVATED: June 24, 2008

EXPIRATION OF SOL: September 26, 2010

Transurban Group (sua sponte submission)

Transurban Group

Transurban (USA) Inc. 1

2 U.S.C. § 441e

11 C.F.R. § 110.20(b)

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED: None

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED: None

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

RELEVANT STATUTES:

COMPLAINANT:

RESPONDENTS:

- This matter was initiated by a sua sponte submission made to the Federal Election
- 30 Commission ("the Commission") by Transurban Group, on behalf of itself and its subsidiary,
- 31 Transurban (USA) Inc. ("Respondents"). In their submission, Respondents admit that they
- violated 2 U.S.C. § 441e by making contributions or donations with funds provided by a foreign
- 33 national in connection with a Federal, State, or local election.

While the sua sponte submission refers collectively to three related domestic subsidiaries of The Transurban Group as "Transurban USA," two of those entities, Transurban (USA) Operations Inc. and Transurban (USA) Holdings Inc. companies do not appear to have made any political contributions. Based on our review of Virginia state contribution records, the checks provided in the submission, and conversations with the Respondents' counsel, we have concluded that the contributions are attributable to "Transurban (USA) Inc." See http://www.vpap.org (search "Donor Search" for "Transurban"). Accordingly, this Office will not make any recommendations regarding the Operations and Holdings companies. Notwithstanding the collective references in the sua sponte submission, all references in this report to "Transurban USA" refer to Transurban (USA) Inc.

1

2

22

II. FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Factual Background

Transurban Group ("the Group"), an Australian-based international toll road developer 3 and manager, began U.S. operations in April 2005 from offices in New York, New York. The 4 Group established three domestic subsidiaries: Transurban (USA) Operations Inc.,; Transurban 5 (USA) Holdings Inc.; and Transurban (USA) Inc. ("Transurban USA"). Although the Group 6 began to generate income from its domestic operations in late 2006, the foreign parent company 7 remained its predominant source of funds through 2007. 8 Respondents hired a government relations firm. The Vectre Corporation ("Vectre"), to 9 support its activities in Virginia. Vectre reportedly advised Respondents that the incorporated 10 U.S. subsidiaries of foreign corporations could make political contributions to state candidates 11 and state political committees in Virginia. Between September 26, 2005 and February 1, 2008. 12 Transurban USA made \$174,000 in nonfederal contributions which are listed in the sua sponte 13 submission and in an attachment to this report. (Attach. 1.) 14 In October 2006, a Transurban Group manager raised a question as to the legality of 15 16 making nonfederal contributions. In a November 2006 email, Vectre's president advised, "In Virginia, corporate contributions are allowed under Virginia law for state elections . . . There is 17 no limit in terms of the amount of contributions." Later that month, he further advised that 18 Virginia did not require corporations to report political contributions, but added a disclaimer that 19 "Vectre is not a law firm and does not provide legal services." Based on the information that 20 21 Vectre provided, the Board approved a report that advocated continuing its political

contributions policy. See Attachments to Sua Sponte Submission

Pre-MUR 473
First General Counsel's Report
Page 3

On February 6, 2008, as part of an ethics briefing from an outside law firm on unrelated federal matters, Transurban USA learned that it could not use funds received from a foreign parent corporation to make contributions or donations in connection with a Federal, State, or local election. Transurban USA promptly contacted the Group's general counsel in Australia, who had joined the company in September 2006 and was unaware of its practice of making such contributions. On February 7, 2008, Transurban Group began an internal investigation through Caplin & Drysdale, Chtd., who interviewed officers, employees, and the Board chairman of the Group and Transurban USA. Caplin & Drysdale also employed a computer forensics firm to identify and preserve potentially relevant computer records. The investigation concluded that Transurban USA and Transurban Group had made foreign national contributions but had done so in mistaken reliance on the advice received from Vectre.

On July 7, 2008, Respondents provided a supplemental submission to inform the Commission that it discovered an additional \$7,000 in contributions, and to detail the remedial actions it had taken to inform the recipients that the contributions violated federal campaign finance laws and to request refunds all prohibited contributions. Respondents further stated that it planned to implement internal controls and processes that would include training on when to seek appropriate legal advice.

B. Analysis

At issue is whether Respondents violated 2 U.S.C. § 441e when the U.S. subsidiary made nonfederal contributions to candidates and political committees in Virginia with funds provided by the foreign parent corporation. It is unlawful for a foreign national, directly or indirectly, to make a contribution or donation of money or other thing of value in connection with a Federal, State, or local election, or to a committee of a political party. 2 U.S.C. § 441e(a)(1)(A), (B); 11

- 1 C.F.R. § 110.20(b). Additionally, a foreign national may not directly or indirectly make an
- 2 expenditure, an independent expenditure, or a disbursement in connection with a Federal, State,
- or local election. 2 U.S.C. § 441e(a)(1)(C); 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(f). Likewise, Commission
- 4 regulations prohibit foreign nationals from directing, dictating, controlling, or directly or
- 5 indirectly participating in the decision-making process of any person, such as a corporation, with
- 6 regard to such person's Federal or nonfederal election-related activities, including decisions
- 7 concerning the making of contributions, donations, expenditures, or disbursements in connection
- with elections for any Federal, State, or local office. 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(i).
- 9 A "foreign national" is an individual who is not a citizen of the United States or a
- national of the United States and who is not lawfully admitted for permanent residence. 2 U.S.C.
- 11 § 441e(b)(2). The term likewise encompasses "a partnership, association, corporation,
- organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal
- 13 place of business in a foreign country." 2 U.S.C. § 441e(b)(1) (citing 22 U.S.C. § 611(b)(3)).
- In determining whether a U.S. subsidiary of a foreign national corporation is permitted to
- make contributions to state and local committees, the Commission, in past Advisory Opinions,
- has looked at two factors. First, the Commission assesses whether the subsidiary is
- predominantly funded by the foreign national such that a contribution by the subsidiary is
- 18 essentially a contribution from the foreign national. Second, the Commission considers the
- 19 status of the decision-makers involved. In Advisory Opinion 1989-20 (Kuilima), a U.S.
- 20 subsidiary of a Japanese company wanted to establish a PAC. However, the subsidiary did not
- 21 yet generate income from its projects and obtained "almost all of its funding from loans and
- contributions" from the foreign parent company. Id. at 1. The AO concluded that the U.S.
- 23 subsidiary could not establish the PAC because it derived a predominant source of funds from

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Pre-MUR 473
First General Counsel's Report
Page 5

the foreign parent company. Id. at 2. As to the second factor, the AO stated that "no director or

2 officer of the company or its parent who is a foreign national may participate in any way in the

decision-making process with regard to making the proposed contributions." Id. at 3. But see

4 Advisory Opinion 1985-03 (Diridon) (allowing a committee to receive a contribution from a

U.S. subsidiary whose financial involvement in the U.S. was "substantial").

In the present matter, Respondents acknowledge the nonfederal contributions to candidates for state office and to state political committees violate 2 U.S.C. § 441e. Indeed, based on the information in the *sua sponte* submission, Transurban USA's activities appear to violate 2 U.S.C. § 441e because it used funds derived predominantly from its foreign parent company to make contributions to nonfederal candidates and political committees. Like the domestic subsidiary in AO 1989-20, Transurban USA had not yet generated enough domestic income so that its nonfederal contributions to state and local committees could be considered separate from the foreign parent. Moreover, Transurban Group violated Commission regulations because its Board of Directors directly participated in determining whether to continue the political contributions policy of its U.S. subsidiaries. 11 C.F.R. § 110.20(i).

The Group, however, asserts that its violations stem from the erroneous advice that Vectre provided. As the submission notes, Transurban USA originally made political contributions on an ad hoc basis based on Vectre's recommendations, and continued to rely on Vectre's supposed expertise to make additional contributions over the next several years. The Group further asserts that none of the employees involved in the violation were aware they had violated federal campaign finance laws. Indeed, Vectre had advised the Group that their activities were entirely legal.

Pre-MUR 473 First General Counsel's Report Page 6

1	As outlined in the submission, Respondents have since taken corrective action that
2	included an immediate end to its political activity following discovery of its violations. Further,
3	in a supplement to the submission dated July 7, 2008, Respondents have sought full refunds from
4	the recipients of its contributions. Respondents also noted that they would implement training to
5	help employees identify when legal counsel is needed.
6	Based on the above, this Office recommends that the Commission find reason to believe
7	that Transurban Group and Transurban (USA) Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441e by making
8	nonfederal contributions to candidates for state office and to state political committees in
9	Virginia that totaled \$174,000 from September 2005 to February 2008.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

Pre-MUR 473 First General Counsel's Report Page 7

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	IV.	RECOMMENDATIONS
17	1)	Open a MUR;
18 19	2)	Find reason to believe that Transurban Group and Transurban (USA) Inc. violated 2 U.S.C. § 441e; and
20 21	3)	· —· — · — · — · — · — · — · — · — · —
22	4)	
23	5)	Approve the appropriate letter.

Thomas	enia Duncan	
General	Counsel	

BY: Kathleen Guith

Deputy Associate General Counsel

for Enforcement

Mark Shonkwiler

Assistant General Counsel

Phillip A. Olaya

Attorney

Attachments:

1. List of Transurban USA State Contributions

Transurban USA, Inc. Contributions to Virginia Candidates and Committees 2005-2008

Amount		Years(s)	Committee Name
\$	12,500	2005, 2006, 2007, 2008	Dominion Leadership Trust
\$	12,000	2006, 2007	Republican Party - Virginia Senate Republican Leadership Trust
\$	10,500	2006, 2007	Democratic Party - Commonwealth Victory Fund
\$	8,000	2005, 2006, 2007	Sesiew for Senate - Richard
\$	7,500	2006, 2007	Republican Party - Virginia House Campaign Committee
\$	5,500	2005, 2006, 2007	Stoech for Senate - Walter
\$	5,000	2007	Connolly for Fairfax County Board Chair - Gerald
\$	5,000		Kilgore for Governor*
\$	5,000	2005, 2006, 2007	Williams for Senate - Martin
\$	5,000		Kaine for Governor - Tim
\$	4,500	2006, 2007	Moving Virginia Forward
\$	4,500	2006, 2007	Stolle for Senate - Kenneth
\$	4,000		Wardrup for Delegate - Leo
\$	3,000		Moran for Delegate - Brian
\$	3,000		Howell for Senate - Janet
\$	2,500	2006, 2007	Houck for Senate - Edward
\$	2,500	2006, 2007, 2008	
\$	2,000		Democratic Party - Virginia Senate Caucus
\$	2,000	2007	Colgan for Senate - Charles
\$	2,000		Democratic Party - Virginia
\$	2,000	2007	Welch for Delegate - John
\$	2,000	2007	Va State Legislative Black Caucus
\$	2,000	2006, 2007	Rust for Delegate - Thomas
\$	2,000		Watkins for Senate - John
\$	1,500	2006, 2007	Scott for Delegate - James
\$	1,500	2006, 2007	Hall for Delegate - Franklin
\$	1,500	2007	Hamilton for Delegate - Phillip
\$	1,500		Chichester for Senate - John
\$	1,500		Hugo for Delegate - Timothy
\$_	1,500		Griffith for Delegate - Morgan
\$	1,500		Quayle for Senate - Frederick
\$	1,500		Norment for Senate - Thomas
\$	1,500		Davis for Senate - Jeannemarie
\$	1,250		Cuccinelli for Senate - Kenneth
\$	1,000		A Strong Majority PAC
\$	1,000		Bulova for Fairfax County Board of Supervisors - Sharon
\$	1,000		Lucas for Senate - Louise
S	1,000		Deeds for Senate - Creigh
\$	1,000		Bell for Senate - Brandon
\$	1,000		Abbitt for Delegate - Watkins
\$	1,000	2007	Whipple for Senate - Mary
\$	1,000	2007	Republican Party - Virginia Republican Senatorial Committee

	4 000	2000 0005	No. 1 - A - A - A - A - A - A - A - A - A -
\$	1,000		Blevins for Senate - Harry
\$	1,000		Cox for Delegate - Kirkland
3	1,000		Watta for Delegate - Vivian
5	1,000		Mersh for Senete - Henry
\$	1,000	2007	Lambert for Senate - Benjamin
\$	1,000		McDonnell for Attorney General - Bob
\$	1,000	2006, 2007	Miller for Senate - Yvonne
\$	1,000		Ticer for Senate - Patricia
\$	1,000	2006	Republican Party - Virginia
\$	1,000	2007	Lingamfeiter for Delegate - Scott
\$	1,000	2007	May for Delegate - Joe
\$	1,000	2006, 2007	Puckett for Senate - Phillip
\$	750	2006, 2007	laquinto for Delegate - Salvatore
\$	750	2007	Caputo for Delegate - Carmin
\$	750	2006, 2007	McDougle for Senate - Ryan
\$	750		Shannon for Delegate - Stephen
\$	750		Ward for Delegate - Jelon
\$	750	2006, 2007	Remas for Senate - Nick
\$	750		BaCote for Delegate - Marriye
\$	750	2006, 2007	O'Brien for Senate - James
\$	500	2007	Amundson for Delegate - Kristen
\$	500	2007	Cosgrave for Delegate - John
\$	500	2007	Melvin for Delegate - Kenneth
8	500	2007	Purksy for Delegate - Bob
\$	500	2007	Herring for Senate - Mark
\$	500	2007	Kligore for Delegate - Terry
\$	500	2007	Spruill for Delegate - Lionell
\$	500	2007	Bulova for Delegate - David
\$	500	2007	Petersen for Senate - Chapman
\$	500	2006	McEachin for Senate - Donald
\$	500	2007	Vanderhye for Delegate - Margaret
\$	500	2007	Frederick for Delegate - Jeffrey
\$	500		Cole for Delegate - Mark
\$	500	2007	Putney for Delegate - Lacey
\$	500		Barker for Senate - George
\$	500		Plum for Delegate - Kenneth
\$	500		Tata for Delegate - Robert
\$	500	2007	Puller for Senate - Linda
\$	500	2007	Bowling for Delegate - Dan
\$	500		Nibxon for Delegate - Sam
\$	500	2008	Landes for Delegate - Steven
\$	500	2007	Martin for Senate - Stephen
\$	500	2006	Callahan for Delegate - Vincent
\$	500		Newman for Senate - Stephen
\$_	500		Deeds for Attorney General - Creigh
\$	500		Jones for Delegate - Dwight

\$	500	2006	Reid for Delegate - John
\$	500	2006	Majority Whip PAC
\$	500		Albo for Delegate - David
\$	500	2006	Wampier for Senate - William
\$	500		McEachin for Delegate - Donald
\$	500	2007	Hanger for Senate - Emmett
\$	500		Stuart for Senate - Richard
\$	500		Joannou for Delegate - Johnny
\$	500		Janis for Delegate - William
\$	250		Frailn for Delegate - Wittern
\$	250		Maraden for Delegate - David
\$	250		McClettan for Delegate - Jennifer
\$	250		Valentine for Delegate - Shannon
\$	250		Sherwood for Delegate - Beverly
\$	250		O'Bannon for Delegate - John
<u> </u>	250		Englin for Delegate - David
\$	174,000		TOTAL*

^{*} Transurban Group identified \$167,000 in political contributions in its initial submission. However, in a supplemental submission dated July 7, 2008, it identified an additional \$7,000 in political contributions, including a \$5,000 contribution to Kilgore for Governor that state public records erroneously recorded as an individual contribution, and a \$2,000 contribution to Sasiaw for Senate that failed to appear on state public records but was cashed by the recipient committee.